

**From:** Zot O'Connor  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/23/02 6:22am  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

I am opposed the the Microsoft settlement as proposed for a number of reasons.

The simplest is that it will do nothing to a) Fix the wrongs that Microsoft has committed on the IT industry, and b) prevent them from happening in the future.

Microsoft has little incentive to stop using its monopoly to thwart opposing companies.

This has hurt consumer, and our national interests.

Only recently did Microsoft \*claim\* to make security important. That means for the last upteen years the majority of our Operating Systems, browsers, works processors and intranet servers were built with people who did not consider security a high priority.

This puts our country at constant risk for cyber warfare.

Had we had a system of competing companies, with people able to choose from several OSeS, browsers, and servers then we would have the choice to use competition to make Microsoft Secure.

I do beleive Microsoft should be broken up. If we look at when break ups were done, the companies (e.g. ATT) performed much greater service and actually maintain a sense of interneal competetion. With Microsoft they have ignored any sense of competetion by driving it out.

Currently Microsoft is continuing it s poor behavior with XP. Little known to users is the fact that they have to connect to Microsoft's server and register the product AFTER they have bought and entered their local serial number in. If they don't Microsoft will render their data unreadable.

Now, if there was 3 OSeS on the market, would consumers allow that?

No.

--

Zot O'Connor

<http://www.ZotConsulting.com>  
<http://www.WhiteKnightHackers.com>

